Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/811,636	MCDEVITT ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	LYNNSY SCHNEIDER	3733
All Participants: Status of Application: <u>allowed</u>		
(1) <u>LYNNSY SCHNEIDER</u> .	(3)	
(2) Rory Pheiffer.	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>12 July 2010</u>	Time: <u>2pm</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: n.a.		
Claims discussed: n.a.		
Prior art documents discussed: 6332778 (Choung)		
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 		
/L. S./ Examiner, Art Unit 3733	Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Application No. 10/811,636

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner contacted Rory Phelifer to discuss amending independent claims 1 and 29 in order to place the application in condition for allowance. Examiner noted that the claims in their current state would be rejected over Choung. Examiner noted that adding the limitations from claim 20 to claim 1 would place claim 1 and claims dependent thereon in condition for allowance. Examiner also noted that in claims 8 and 36, "a lissue attachment member having a bore" should be "a tissue attachment member in the form of a bore". Rory Phelifer agreed. It was also noted that the "second shaft" of claim 24 should be "said insertion shaft". It was noted by Examiner that amending claim 29 to state that the installation tool shaft is releasably secured (rather than configured to be releasably secured) would place claim 29 and claims dependent thereon in condition for allowance. Examiner also noted that terminal disclaimers would need to be filed for Patent no.'s 6733506 and 6770073. Rory Phelifer agreed to the amendments and to filing the terminal disclaimers. See the Examiner's Amendment for the final version of the amendments.